

# THE CANDID EXAMINER.

"EXAMINE YOURSELVES, WHETHER YE BE IN THE FAITH ; PROVE YOUR OWN SELVES." —Paul.

VOL. 2.]

MONROE, PA. DEC. 11, 1825.

NO. 13

For the *Candid Examiner.*

No. X.

Examiner Observed—A rejoinder, &c.

In our third number we gave an answer to the arguments, and an explanation of the passages of scripture which were produced by the writer we were reviewing, in support of his theory. These constituting the main bulwarks of universalism, we were far from expecting they would be given up without a struggle. But to what purpose the Editor has exerted himself in their defence we shall now proceed to inquire.

The first argument in favor of the doctrine we oppose is drawn from the *will of God*.—After partially introducing our answer to this argument he gives us a new (though not an *approved*) edition of it, thus. "God has said 'my council shall stand and I will do all my pleasure' Paul informs us that God 'having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in him.'—Here is the will of God in as positive terms as language can render it." To this we answer, 1. That God's 'council will stand' and that he will do all his pleasure, we do not doubt. But the question is whether it is according to his *council and good pleasure*, to save all men absolutely independent of, or in opposition to, their own free choice. 2. As to the passage taken from Ephesians, (Chap 1. 10.) several things can be made out before it can suit his purpose. 1. That the dispensation of the fulness of time, refers to the time of the restoration. 2. That the terms *all things*, &c. embrace every individual of the whole human family. And indeed all the fallen angels. And in that case the Apostle ought to have added to things in heaven, and things in earth, *things also in hell!* And 3. That being 'gathered in Christ' in this place, refers to final and eternal salvation !! Until he does this however positive, the language may be, it does not serve his cause at all.

In our answer we remarked, that 'what the apostle intends by the words 'God will save all men to be saved' can be nothing else than his disposition to save sinners and make them

happy, in a way consistent with their *free agency*.' To this he proposes a number of objections. "Why did a God of infinite wisdom and knowledge delegate to sinners a free agency which he must have known would frustrate his disposition or will?" We might ask the same question in relation to moral evil, which as much *frustrates the will of God*, as the final damnation of the sinner. This question he is as much concerned to answer as we are, and when he answers it, he will have a complete and satisfactory answer to the one which he proposes. He proceeds, "the idea that God committed to men a *free agency* omnipotent over his purpose, will and disposition, is in our view preposterous in the extreme." Answer. 1. God has no "purpose" to save men but in a way consistent with their nature as moral agents. 2. That God could save all men; that is, that he possesses power adequate to that, or any other object, we do not question. But will our Examiner put God upon doing every thing that he has power to do, without any regard to moral fitness? Would not this be "preposterous in the extreme?" He farther says "That God has a disposition for all men to be saved, and yet, that all men will not be saved supposes that he is, and ever will be a disappointed being" By no means. Unless he has a disposition to save them, *absolutely and unconditionally*. He has never desired the salvation of any, but in compliance with the terms upon which this salvation is suspended.

Our editor adds, "It is not denied but that men are moral agents, but this agency we hold is limited, and can never destroy the purposes of God in the salvation of our race." We beg leave to answer this in the words of an able and ingenious writer,\* "In all the divine dispensations in relation to man, God has an eye to his free agency, and will not destroy it. Misery entered with the abuse of liberty; and the possibility of the abuse of it being continued militate against the certainty of the restoration in question; for to say that a man endowed with the liberty to sin, must necessarily be virtuous, is a contradiction in terms."

He finally comes to our argument "Observer"

\*See the doctrine of universal restoration examined and refuted by D. Isaac. p. 21.

has drawn a strange inference from the position that God's *will must be done*. Thus he writes "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." Well it is the will of God that they should not sin. Therefore according to our writers logic there is no such thing in the universe as sin." This is drawing conclusions at random. What is the will of God concerning sinners? that they should be saved from their sins and be made happy. What conclusion would naturally be drawn from this. That there is no such thing in the universe as sin?" The gentleman has certainly made a very singular shift to evade a plain and necessary conclusion, the force of which he plainly saw would prostrate his beloved argument. Our answer stands thus "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." It is the will of God that they should not sin.—Therefore, there is no such thing in the universe as sin. The will of God, against the existence of moral evil we thought as obviously asserted as against final misery. We therefore thought the conclusion that there is no such thing in existence as sin as legitimate as the conclusion, that all will be saved. And as this argument concludes against the fact of the introduction, and continuance to the present, of moral evil, it must be false.—Now how has he answered this argument? He has changed the premises; instead of "it is the will of God that his creatures should not sin," he has, it is the will of God "that they should be saved from their sins;" and then asks "what conclusion would naturally be drawn from this? That there is no such thing in the universe as sin?" &c. This he supposes would be "drawing conclusions at random." But does this gentleman himself act "at random" when he violently forces our conclusion from our premises, and tacks it on to his own, in order to fault our logic, or make our argument inconclusive? Or does he discover a studied design to save himself the task of looking our argument in the face! We ask no further favors of him, than to meet us on the ground of fair argumentation. If upon this ground he will show that our answer to this *formidable* argument of the universalists, is not conclusive, we pledge ourselves so find out some other method to answer it, or submit to its force!! He proceeds "there is sin and it is contrary to the will of Jehovah." This is a *grand concession* indeed! Sin is in existence "*contrary to the will of God*." In this case then, to use his own language the will of God is "*frustrated*." Let him now face about, and answer his own arguments, for they all go as directly against this concession of his, as they do against our doctrine of eternal punishment! Again he says

"Universalists do not believe that the ultimate will or purpose of God concerning sinners is already done while they are sinners but it must in due time be done in their deliverance from sin." But if the will of God is not now done, how does he know that it will be ultimately? If it may be thwarted for a moment, may it not be for an age, yea to eternity? Finally "does it consequently follow that because God wills the salvation of sinners and because that will, will finally be done that *sin of every kind is according to the will of Jehovah*?" It consequently follows that if *God's will is done in every thing then sin of every kind is according to the will of Jehovah*. This was the manner in which this part of our argument was stated. It consequently follows that the cause which requires that the arguments of an opponent should be *perverted* and *mis-stated* before they can be answered must be a desperate cause! And it consequently follows, from the whole that the conclusion drawn "at random" is like the bow drawn at a venture—it smote Ahab between the joints of the harness!!!

That part of this reply which relates to conditions we answered in the preceding number. We come now to see what he has said on the scripture evidence. He thinks that the general remarks which we made upon the passages under consideration, "recall the objections against universal salvation contained in our previous remarks." But how he can in any consistency think so we cannot perceive. Does the phrase "general conversion of the nations which is yet to take place" make any thing in favor of universalism? And these are the words it is presumed upon which he predicates his remark. And does this go to say that all who have *died unconverted* will be saved? Does it go to say that *every individual*, of those nations which should *generally* be converted, will be converted and saved? Especially when we allude in the very next sentence that *general terms*, were not always to be taken in an *absolute* sense. Indeed we have conceded nothing at all.

The rule he lays down for understanding the extent of these "general terms *all flesh, all nations,*" &c. is as follows. "If there is positive and unequivocal testimony that a part of mankind will be endlessly miserable, then these general terms are limited in their signification; but if there are not, and there are unequivocal scriptures to establish universal salvation, then these *general terms* corroborate the same doctrine." To this rule we do not object, and shall pass to examine the "unequivocal scriptures which he brings forward on his side of the question. He introduces them with the remark,

that "every is an unequivocal term." But if he will carefully examine, he will find that even this term must be sometimes limited.\* The first passage is "Jesus tasted death for every man." On this passage there will be no dispute between us, as to its *extent*. The only thing in dispute will be whether all for whom Christ died will finally be saved. The next is Isa. 45. 23. "unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." We suppose that the Editor entertains Mr. Winchesters opinion upon this text "that every knee shall bow to him as their Lord, and swear allegiance and fealty to his righteous and just government,"† What then could the prophet mean by immediately adding, "and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." Especially since God always requires the most excellent things to be offered to him, and in the most free and willing manner and as he requires the whole heart, mind and strength to be fully dedicated to him, it is not likely that he will accept of a nominal, unwilling, and forced subjection and praise.‡ Now to be incensed against God, is to be *enkindled to rage—infamed with anger—to be provoked and exasperated against him.*§ And can any one see how these feelings are consistent with the act of dedicating to God "the most excellent things" yea, "all the heart, mind and strength—in a most free and willing manner." If so they can reconcile the most palpable contradictions and reconcile Mr. Winchester's theory with the word of God! But the Apostle Paul alludes to this passage in Rom. 14. 10, 11, 12. Phil. 2. 2, 10, 11. Instead of inferring from it an universal restoration, he quotes it in the former passage, as proving an universal Judgment. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live saith the Lord every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11, must be interpreted as referring to the same event, to make the apostle a consistant writer.||

Finally, "John heard every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, ascribing blessing, and honor, and glory,

\*See Col. 1. 23. ii. Cor. 2. 14. Mat. 9. 35. Rev. 6. 15.

† See Winchester's Lectures, vol. 2. p. 237.

‡ Ibid. p. 139.

§ See Walkers large Dictionary.

|| See Mr. Isaac, p. 36, 37.

and power unto God, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." These words, says Dr. Chauncey\*, evidently look forward to the completion of the scheme of God with reference to mankind; bringing in the sinless intelligence above, as uniting with the whole race of Adam, in giving the glory of thier restitution to God. To which an able antagonist replies "If our author had first proved a state of correction, or discipline, for the 'cure of the patients themselves after the last judgment, and before the 'completion of the scheme of God with regard to all mankind,' this text would have gone farther towards proving the final restoration of all things; but even then he must have proved that this text looks forward to that period." The connections plainly show that it does not, but that it is accomplished in time, and probably had its fulfilment long since. But should we understand by *every creature*, only *every one* of the distinctive characters of holy, or righteous, we are sure that the scriptures will bear us out. For then the phrase *every creature*, is a strong *hyperbole*, a figure frequently used in the sacred writings. Of this we will give only two instances out of many. The first is of the wicked in Rev. 4. 15, 16, 17, which are. "Notwithstanding the description in this place is so very explicit and full, yet we are sure that the righteous are not included in it. The second is a joyful event only as it respects God's people the Jews, viz. the destruction of old Babylon, 'The heavens and the earth, all that is therein, shall sing for Babylon; for the spoilers come unto her from the north saith the Lord.' Jer. 51. 48. Notwithstanding *all in heaven and earth* are said to sing on this occasion; yet the thousands of Chaldea, with her commercial connections. See Rev. 18. 9—19. And all those who were in their graves, at least that part of them who died in their sins, were necessarily excluded from participating in this joyful event. Lastly. It may be observed that St. John does not mention *hell* among the places which contribute to the general chorus; which is an omission we cannot account for, if he really meant that they were redeemed from that place of torment.†

Thus we see that these "unequivocal scriptures," which our Editor alleges in support of "universal salvation," do not certainly, "establish" that doctrine. That for *very good reasons* we believe them perfectly consistent with the doctrine of eternal punishment!

#### OBSERVER

\* See salvation of all men, p. 238, 239.

† Universal Salvation refuted, p. 61, 62.

has drawn a strange inference from the position that God's *will must be done*. Thus he writes "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." Well it is the will of God that they should not sin. Therefore according to our writers logic there is no such thing in the universe as sin." This is drawing conclusions at random. What is the will of God concerning sinners? that they should be saved from their sins and be made happy. What conclusion would naturally be drawn from this. That there is no such thing in the universe as sin?" The gentleman has certainly made a very singular shift to evade a plain and necessary conclusion, the force of which he plainly saw would prostrate his beloved argument. Our answer stands thus "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." It is the will of God that they should not sin.—Therefore, there is no such thing in the universe as sin. The will of God, against the existence of moral evil we thought as obviously asserted as against final misery. We therefore thought the conclusion that there is no such thing in existence as sin as legitimate as the conclusion, that all will be saved. And as this argument concludes against the fact of the introduction, and continuance to the present, of moral evil, it must be false.—Now how has he answered this argument? He has changed the premises; instead of 'it is the will of God that his creatures should not sin,' he has, it is the will of God "that they should be saved from their sins;" and then asks "what conclusion would naturally be drawn from this? That there is no such thing in the universe as sin?" &c. This he supposes would be "drawing conclusions at random." But does this gentleman himself act "at random" when he violently forces our conclusion from our premises, and tacks it on to his own, in order to fault our logic, or make our argument inconclusive? Or does he discover a studied design to save himself the task of looking our argument in the face! We ask no further favors of him, than to meet us on the ground of fair argumentation. If upon this ground he will show that our answer to this *formidable* argument of the universalists, is not conclusive, we pledge ourselves so find out some other method to answer it, or submit to its force!! He proceeds "there is sin and it is contrary to the will of Jehovah." This is a *grand concession* indeed! Sin is in existence "contrary to the will of God." In this case then, to use his own language the will of God is "*frustrated*." Let him now face about, and answer his own arguments, for they all go as directly against this concession of his, as they do against our doctrine of eternal punishment! Again he says

"Universalists do not believe that the ultimate will or purpose of God concerning sinners is already done while they are sinners but it must in due time be done in their deliverance from sin." But if the will of God is not now done, how does he know that it will be ultimately? If it may be thwarted for a moment, may it not be for an age, yea to eternity? Finally "does it consequently follow that because God wills the salvation of sinners and because that will, will finally be done that *sin of every kind is according to the will of Jehovah?*" It consequently follows that if *God's will is done in every thing then sin of every kind is according to the will of Jehovah*. This was the manner in which this part of our argument was stated. It consequently follows that the cause which requires that the arguments of an opponent should be *perverted* and *mis-stated* before they can be answered must be a desperate cause! And it consequently follows, from the whole that the 'conclusion' drawn "at random" is like the bow drawn at a venture—it smote Ahab between the joints of the harness!!!

That part of this reply which relates to conditions we answered in the preceding number. We come now to see what he has said on the scripture evidence. He thinks that the general remarks which we made upon the passages under consideration, "recall the objections against universal salvation contained in our previous remarks." But how he can in any consistency think so we cannot perceive. Does the phrase 'general conversion of the nations which is yet to take place' make any thing in favor of universalism? And these are the words it is presumed upon which he predicates his remark. And does this go to say that all who have *died unconverted* will be saved? Does it go to say that *every individual*, of those nations which should *generally* be converted, will be converted and saved? Especially when we adduced in the very next sentence that *general terms*, were not always to be taken in an *absolute* sense. Indeed we have conceded nothing at all.

The rule he lays down for understanding the extent of these "general terms *all flesh, all nations,*" &c. is as follows. "If there is positive and unequivocal testimony that a part of mankind will be endlessly miserable, then these general terms are limited in their signification; but if there are not, and there are unequivocal scriptures to establish universal salvation, then these *general terms* corroborate the same doctrine." To this rule we do not object, and shall pass to examine the "unequivocal scriptures which he brings forward on his side of the question. He introduces them with the remark,

that "every is an unequivocal term." But if he will carefully examine, he will find that even this term must be sometimes limited.\* The first passage is "Jesus tasted death for every man." On this passage there will be no dispute between us, as to its *extent*. The only thing in dispute will be whether all for whom Christ died will finally be saved. The next is Isa. 45. 23. "unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." We suppose that the Editor entertains Mr. Winchesters opinion upon this text "that every knee shall bow to him as their Lord, and swear allegiance and fealty to his righteous and just government."† What then could the prophet mean by immediately adding, "and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." Especially since God always requires the most excellent things to be offered to him, and in the most free and willing manner and as he requires the whole heart, mind and strength to be fully dedicated to him, it is not likely that he will accept of a nominal, unwilling, and forced subjection and praise.‡ Now to be *incensed against God*, is to be *enkindled to rage—infamed with anger—to be provoked and exasperated against him.*§ And can any one see how these feelings are consistent with the act of dedicating to God "the most excellent things" yea, "all the heart, mind and strength—in a most free and willing manner." If so they can reconcile the most palpable contradictions and reconcile Mr. Winchester's theory with the word of God! But the Apostle Paul alludes to this passage in Rom. 14. 10, 11, 12. Phil. 2. 2, 10, 11. Instead of inferring from it an universal restoration, he quotes it in the former passage, as proving an universal Judgment. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live saith the Lord every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11, must be interpreted as referring to the same event, to make the apostle a consistant writer.]

Finally, "John heard every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, ascribing blessing, and honor, and glory,

\*See Col. 1. 23. ii. Cor. 2. 14. Mat. 9. 35. Rev. 6. 15.

† See Winchester's Lectures, vol. 2. p. 237.

‡ Ibid. p. 139.

§ See Walkers large Dictionary.

|| See Mr. Isaac, p. 86, 87.

and power unto God, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." These words, says Dr. Chauncey\*, evidently look forward to the completion of the scheme of God with reference to mankind; bringing in the sinless intelligence above, as uniting with the whole race of Adam, in giving the glory of thier restitution to God." To which an able antagonist replies "If our author had first proved a state of correction, or discipline, for the 'cure of the patients themselves after the last judgment, and before the 'completion of the scheme of God with regard to all mankind,' this text would have gone farther towards proving the final restoration of all things; but even then he must have proved that this text looks forward to that period." The connections plainly show that it does not, but that it is accomplished in time, and probably had its fulfilment long since. "But should we understand by *every creature*, only every one of the distinctive characters of holy, or righteous, we are sure that the scriptures will bear us out. For then the phrase *every creature*, is a strong *hyperbole*, a figure frequently used in the sacred writings. Of this we will give only two instances out of many. The first is of the wicked in Rev. 4. 15, 16, 17, which are. 'Notwithstanding the description in this place is so very explicit and full, yet we are sure that the righteous are not included in it. The second is a joyful event only as it respects God's people the Jews, viz. the destruction of old Babylon, 'The heavens and the earth, all that is therein, shall sing for Babylon; for the spoilers come unto her from the north saith the Lord.' Jer. 51. 48. Notwithstanding *all in heaven and earth* are said to sing on this occasion; yet the thousands of Chaldea, with her commercial connections. See Rev. 18. 9—19. And all those who were in their graves, at least that part of them who died in their sins, were necessarily excluded from participating in this joyful event. Lastly. It may be observed that St. John does not mention *hell* among the places which contribute to the general chorus; which is an omission we cannot account for, if he really meant that they were redeemed from that place of torment."†

Thus we see that these "unequivocal scriptures," which our Editor alleges in support of "universal salvation," do not certainly, "establish" that doctrine. That for *very good reasons* we believe them perfectly consistent with the doctrine of eternal punishment!

#### OBSERVER

\* See salvation of all men, p. 238, 239.

† Universal Salvation refuted, p. 61, 62.

**REPLY.**

Observer in his commencement appears like a man triumphing in a deceptive dream, in which he fancies the "main bulwarks of universalism," against which he had frowned in the aspect of a troubled cloud without rain or storm, to have been "given up without a struggle." But it is very singular that he should be so lengthy in opposing what he imagines to "be given up." Some particulars in his arguments against our position, that the *will of God must be done*, demands some attention, not so much for their merit, as for their inconsistency. He consents to the fact, that "God's counsel will stand, and that he will do all his pleasure," but he insinuates that it is not the good pleasure of God to save all "in opposition to their own free choice." In this insinuation, we know not against whom he is arguing, but it cannot be against us; for we never have intimated that God would save all or any in opposition to their own free choice. We should hardly think he was obscurely introducing the gloomy hypothesis of calvinism in this insinuation, were it not for what he says in continuation. He supposes the testimony of Paul concerning the mystery of God's "will according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ," does not suit our purpose, until we first make out among other particulars, that "all things &c. embrace every individual of the whole human family." On this we would remark that it is God's will, good pleasure and purpose to save or gather together in Christ, all who are embraced in the "terms all things," and it is not his *will to save any more*; therefore if the "terms all things" do not "embrace every individual of the whole human family," that part of the human family which are not embraced in the *terms all things*, it is not God's will, good pleasure and purpose to gather together in Christ. Reader is not this calvinism in good earnest? Observer alledges as a reason why the above Scripture on the will of God, does not prove universal salvation, that *all things*, who were embraced in God's will according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself to gather together in Christ, do not "embrace every individual of the whole human family;" therefore every individual of the whole human family, it is not God's will, good pleasure and purpose to save. It has been a great theme in Observer's arguments, formerly, that it is God's will or disposition to save all, but the reason why all will not be saved, is, because his will, will not be done. But now he supports that God's "counsel will

*stand, and that he will do all his pleasure;*" and now the reason why all will not be saved, is because "all things" whom it is the will, good pleasure and purpose of God to gather together in Christ, do not embrace every individual of the whole human family. It is really mortifying to meet with an opponent so identified with intitibily. Observer does not *question* but "that God could save all men," but he enquires, "will our examiner put God upon doing every thing that he has power to do, without any regard to moral fitness?" If this argument means any thing, it means though God could save all men, yet the reason why he will not save all is, because it would not be according to *moral fitness*. But we will proceed to that part of Observer's rejoinder where he complains so bitterly of some premises and conclusions which he has attempted to impose on the universalists. The following is our position, "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." Observer infers the following from this position, "it is the will of God that they should not sin, therefore there is no such thing in the universe as sin." Are these conclusions legitimate? By no means. Our conclusion should thus be stated to make them legitimate. The *ultimate will of God concerning sinners* is already done. Then our rejoinder might properly infer the conclusion: "It is the will of God that they shd not sin; therefore there is no such thing in the universe as sin!" All those scriptures on which we have predicated our premises concerning the will of God, express future tense. So do our premises express future tense. The following is our statement on this subject—"Universalists do not believe that the ultimate will or purpose of God concerning sinners is already done while they are sinners, but that it must be done in their deliverance from sin." Mark Observer meets this statement, "But if the will of God is not now done, how does he know that it will be ultimately?" If it may be thwarted for a moment may it not be for an age, yea, to eternity?" Reader, is not this down right skepticism? Because God's ultimate will and purpose are not now done, because the vast plan of his infinite wisdom, is not already executed, *how do we know they ever will be ultimately?* For instance Observer had lived in the days of Abraham, and had been informed by that venerable patriarch, that it was God's will and good pleasure, and that he had promised that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed; Observer's argument would have replied to this gracious revelation as follows, this will is not now done all the families of the earth are not now blessed, therefore how do we know that they *ever will be ultimately blessed?* Thus he would have

skeptic to the promise of God. Jesus taught us to pray, "Our Father which art in heaven—thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." But the will of God is not now done in earth, as it is in heaven, therefore, *how do we know that it will be ultimately?* Again Jesus said, "my meat and my drink is to do my father's will," and again, "I came down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of him that sent me; and this is the will of him that sent me that of all he hath given me, I should loose nothing, but raise it up at the last day." God has said "all souls are mine," Jesus said to his father, "all thine are mine." He also said, "the father loveth the son and hath given all things into his hands," and Jesus came to do the will of his father, which is, that of all that the father hath given him he should loose nothing, but raise it up again. But all that were given him, are not raised up now—God's will in this respect, is not now done—how, enquires Observer, do we know that it will be ultimately? We answer him in the language of the prophet, "The Lord will hasten it in his time." The 60th chapter of Isaiah is entirely taken up in gracious promises and sublime predictions concerning the latter day of glory, when the kingdom of satan shall be demolished, and the kingdom of the redeemer be built up lasting as eternity and splendid as heaven. The prophet closes with the following appropriate remark which may properly be applied to all doubting skeptics, "The Lord will hasten it in his time." The Lord has chosen his own time and way to bring about the vast plan of his grace. He has chosen the dispensation of the fullness of time for the fulfilment of his will, good pleasure and purpose in gathering together in Christ all things. How puerile, then, Observer appears in endeavoring to prove that the will, good pleasure and purpose of God in this splendid plan of grace and goodness, will never be accomplished, by saying that "if the will of God is not now done, how does he know that it will be ultimately?" We think he was perfectly consistent in comparing his conclusion to the bow and arrow of a heathen soldier, for we are confident it bears no analogy to the spiritual weapon of a christian.

There is another idea closely connected in meaning with the one we have been examining, which we shall notice for no other reason than for the importance which Observer puts upon it. It is his suggestion "in relation to moral evil, which," he says, "as much frustrates the will of God, as the final damnation of the sinner." Did Observer never think of the circumstances attending the history of Joseph and his brethren? If he has not we wish him to

mark the evil and black designs of these brethren in selling Joseph into Egypt, and torturing the feelings of their aged father by their deception and perfidy. Both these brethren and Jehovah had their designs and meaning in all the transactions of this affecting tragedy—they meant it for evil, but he for good. Hear the testimony of Joseph on this subject: "But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." The question now occurs, was the will of God as much frustrated by the moral evil of these brethren in their base designs and evil machinations against Joseph, as it would have been in the destruction of the whole family and much other people whom he meant to save alive by these very means? The reader will readily apprehend how Observer with his present views and plan of argument, would have treated this subject, had he lived in the days these events were transpiring. Had it been communicated to him at a time when these events looked dark and inexplicable, before the plan of God was brought about, that God had a good plan and meaning in these events, and that his will must be done, he would have replied to the gracious communication as follows: *If God has a meaning and good design in these things, if his will must be done, it must follow that there is no such thing as sin in these brethren—or, the moral evil of these brethren as much frustrates the will of God, as the destruction of all those people he means so save alive.* Again, he would have met the communication thus: *the will of God in these things, is not now done, how then do we know that it will be ultimately?* We tell Observer that God's counsel will stand—his will must be done—his promises can never fail—the Lord will hasten it in his time. If Observer doubts and disbelieves these things because God's ultimate will is not now done, because his promises are not now fulfilled, we would address him in the reasonable language of Peter—"Be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness." Therefore, "be not faithless, but believing"—"stand still," wait with patience, and you shall yet "see the salvation of God."

The second part of Observer's rejoinder, containing the essays of Dr. Chauncy, Dr. Isaac, &c. &c. &c. as it seems to prolong the controversy without adding any thing new or important, will receive no attention as it manifests nothing to us but the agony under which the system of Observer is struggling.

**CANDID EXAMINER.****"WHAT IS TRUTH."****MONTROSE, DECEMBER 11.****TO OUR PATRONS.**

Our patrons will remember that the conditions of the Examiner, were one dollar, to be paid at the expiration of the 6th No. The 13th No. is now issued, and we are obliged to remind our subscribers of the importance of some degree of punctuality in order to enable us to defray the expenses of publication. Those who have conformed to the conditions of the Examiner by forwarding the sums due, have greatly obliged us, and receive our particular thanks. And those who appear to be forgetful of their engagements and of our necessity, are respectfully requested to forward the amount due, immediately, or as soon as they can make it convenient, by which they will essentially assist us in meeting our engagements. It is but a trifle from each subscriber, yet on these trifles we depend for defraying the expense of printing and paper. Such of our patrons who may have forgotten they are in arrears for the first volume, we trust will call to mind that we stand in need of their assistance, and are requested to forward their arrearages accordingly.

In those neighbourhoods where we have not an agent, some one of our patrons will do us the favor to act in that capacity. Those who act as agents and forward the pay to the amount of 8 or more papers, will receive their own paper gratis. Those who forward their subscriptions by mail, are not required to pay postage.

As we have frequently been requested to give the articles of faith believed in by Universal-

ists, we are under the necessity of stating that we profess and acknowledge no creed but the *Holy Bible*, which we receive as the guide and rule of our faith and practice; and separate from this book, we have not a long list of articles of faith invented by men. Notwithstanding we may appear singular from most other sects in this respect, yet we never have desired, like ancient Israel in their pride and degeneracy, to have a *king like other nations*. The following Articles adopted by the General Convention of Universalists, are all we are able to give. They contain some general outlines of the distinguishing sentiments of the order.

**Article 1st.** We believe that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, contain a revelation of the character of God, and of *the duty, interest and final destination* of mankind.

**Article 2d.** We believe that there is *one* God whose nature is *love* revealed in *one* Lord Jesus Christ, by *one* Holy Spirit of truth who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

**Article 3d.** We believe that holiness and *true* happiness are inseparably connected, and that believers ought to be careful to maintain order, and to practice good works: for these things are good and profitable unto men.

*From the Evangelical Restorationist.*

**PRAYERS FOR ALL MEN.**

The great Apostle to the Gentiles has given us the most excellent directions for praying, both in regard to the subjects of prayer and the temper of mind with which we ought to pray. He exhorts that "first of all," (as the primary or most important petitions to be offered) "supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for *all men every where*, for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have *all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth*." This prayer is in perfect accordance with the best wishes and most benevolent feelings of every christian, of

every sect and denomination. It is what every benevolent person most devoutly desires and prays may take place. It is the first prayer breathed by every new convert to Christ—every new-born soul into the kingdom of God. All whose hearts are right with God pray for the salvation of all men; however they may differ in the theory, or the religion of their heads, that of the heart is alike in all Christians. And they are all Universalists at heart, because the heart's desire of all sincere Christians is that all may be saved and brought to the knowledge of the truth. But

*Secondly*, the temper of mind with which we are exhorted to pray, is to be noticed. The apostle exhorts to pray “*lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting*”—to “pray in faith, nothing wavering; for he that wavereth, is as a wave of the sea, driven and tossed.” and further, informs us that “*whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.*”

Hence we are exhorted, not only to pray for all men, but to pray in faith, that is, believing that God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth: knowing that, as “*whatsoever is not of faith is sin,*” our prayers for the salvation of all men, unless we believe in it, are but sin and abomination in the sight of God. Yet how frequently do we hear the professed ministers of the gospel pray for the salvation of *all men* in one breath, and almost in the next call it a *damnable heresy* to believe in it? That is, to believe that their prayers will be answered! Universalists pray, in this respect, exactly as their orthodox neighbours do, only the former pray in faith, fully believing that their prayers will be answered, and the latter do not: and yet the universalist is condemned by his neighbor, and for no other reason than because he prays in faith “nothing wavering” as the scriptures direct.

Universalists pray exactly as they preach, that is, for the salvation of all men. Limitarians pray for one thing, and preach another, their prayers and their sermons being directly the reverse of each other. This being the case we may reasonably conclude that one or the other, either their prayers or their sermons are wrong, for they do not correspond with each other. But we have seen that when they pray for the salvation of all men, they pray just as the apostle directs. Let them believe and preach just as they pray, and all will be right. An aged divine once, in counselling a young preacher, advised him always to pray over his sermons before preaching them. But how would our orthodox brethren appear in praying over their sermons before preaching them? How would they appear in praying for the endless

misery and indescribable torment of the greatest part of their fellow beings? They *must* pray for this if they pray over their sermons. And they must pray for this if they pray for that in which they have faith to believe. But as the religion of their hearts is better than that of their heads, they cannot desire nor pray for that which the theory of their heads teaches them is true: but must, while influenced by the Spirit of God, and the natural benevolence of their own hearts, pray for the salvation of all men. And would to heaven that they might be led to believe that *God is as good as they are*—that *his desires are as benevolent towards the human race as theirs possibly can be*—and that *His spirit would never dictate prayers for the happiness of all men, which he determined never to answer.* Let “men pray every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting,” that God’s will may be done, which is that all men should “be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.”

### SUICIDE.

There were three Suicides committed in this city, on Thursday last. One wretched old man drowned himself. A young man, laboring under what is called a religious frenzy, (strange that here should be any frenzy in religion) cut his throat from ear to ear, and died in a few minutes. A woman, whether young or old, or for what cause we have not learned, did the same, and shared the same fate. If we understand what is meant by religious frenzy, it is terror excited in the mind of the victim, of the punishment she or he is doomed to receive in the next life. The young man above mentioned, was continually haunted by this horrible anticipation. Such possession had it taken of his mind, that he frequently fancied that he saw the Saviour with a drawn sword, ready to hew him to pieces! It is a pity indeed that religion should be so badly understood, or so poorly explained, and in such cases as to lead to fatal consequences. And it would, in some cases, be more to the credit of the heads and hearts of its teachers, were they to represent the Deity as a merciful, instead of a vindictive and malignant being. Nothing is more pernicious than fanatical zeal—nothing more salutary than true piety, which loves God for his goodness, venerates HIM for his justice, but does not fear him, because of his mercy, “which endur-

'eth forever.' Conversions founded on fear or terror, serve no other purpose, in most cases, but to render the convert useless, as well as miserable, in this life, without affording him any rational hope of the future. How much more beautiful, captivating and exciting, to deeds of virtue, a life of utility and beneficence, is that view of the goodness of God, so happily depicted by the Psalmist, when expressing the fullness of his confidence in Divine Grace: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness, for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk thro' the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil: for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." If such were the views of God's goodness and grace, inculcated on all occasions, from the pulpit, we should see none but sound converts, and hear of no weak-minded people cutting their throats from a sort of "religious frenzy."

*Albany Observer.*

#### SUBLIMITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

BY PAUL ALLEN.

The holy scriptures have not been attended to as furnishing a model for the beautiful and sublime as they ought to be. We hear of beautiful and sublime passages from Homer and from Virgil, while the real fountains of both beauty and sublimity have been neglected. Let us try this point by an example derived from the pages of Virgil. Virgil is now describing the ghost of Hector, who appears to Æneas to inform him that Troy is in a state of conflagration; we will take Dryden's version of the passage, that does no injustice to the original.

*"Twas now the dead of night when sleep repairs  
Our bodies worn with toils, our minds with  
cares,  
When Hector's ghost before my sight appears,  
Shrouded in blood he was, and bathed in tears—  
Swollen were his limbs as when the thongs were  
thrust*

*Through the deep holes, his body black with  
dust.*

*Such as he was when by Pelides slain,  
Thessalian courses drew him o'er the plain."*

There the ghost of Hector appears precisely in the situation in which the dead body of that hero was when his ankle joints were bored and his corpse dragged three times round the walls of Troy by Achilles. His "body is black with dust—bloody, and his limbs swollen by the laceration made in his ankle joints—it is a disgusting picture.

Let us take an example from Job. "In visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on man, fear came upon me that made all my bones to shake—there was silence, and I heard a voice—the hair of my flesh stood up—a spirit passed before mine eye, but I could not discover the form thereof." The sublimity of this passage puts to shame the quotation from Virgil—it resides in obscurity.

#### POETRY.

##### LIFE.

The leaf that dies in autumn's hour,  
The flower that withers on its stem,  
Are emblems of immortal power,  
Of time and change on us and them.

Yet happier is the sleeping rose—  
For spring will all its leaves restore,  
Although it sweetly takes repose,  
It wakes again at summer's hour.

But when life's early dreams depart,  
And grief succeeds our fancied bliss;  
Oh! what will cheer the lonely heart,  
Or point to future happiness.

Years will glide on: and time will bring  
Its transient changes but in vain—  
We have in life but one short spring,  
And that can ne'er return again!

But look beyond this fading light,  
From whence our joys are given—  
Where all our kindred souls unite,  
And join the choir in heaven.

ERRATA.—No 11, 84th page, letter to Mr. Kendall, should have been signed *Francis Brewster* instead of *Francis Beeter*. No. 12, 92d page, 2d col. 17 lines from the top, for ever read aver.